

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

10 JANE DOE,

11 Plaintiff(s),

12 v.

13 UNITED AIRLINES, INC.,

14 Defendant(s).  
15

Case No. 2:17-cv-02825-RFB-NJK

ORDER

(Docket No. 12)

16 Pending before the Court is a stipulated protective order. Docket No. 12. As a threshold matter,  
17 the parties seek to keep confidential the plaintiff's identity. *See id.* at 2. No motion has been filed  
18 seeking leave for Plaintiff to proceed in this matter pseudonymously. When a Plaintiff seeks to proceed  
19 with a lawsuit using a pseudonym, she must file a motion seeking permission to do so and must address  
20 the applicable standards. *See, e.g., 4 Exotic Dancers v. Spearmint Rhino*, 2009 WL 250054, \*1 (C.D.  
21 Cal. Jan. 29, 2009). Moreover, the stipulated protective order fails to include legal authority or  
22 meaningfully developed argument that pseudonymity is appropriate here. Accordingly, the stipulated  
23 protective order is hereby **DENIED** without prejudice. To the extent Plaintiff wishes to proceed in this  
24 case pseudonymously, she must file a proper motion seeking such relief and addressing the applicable  
25 standards.<sup>1</sup> Any such motion shall be filed within seven days of the issuance of this order, and shall be  
26

27  
28 <sup>1</sup> The Court is not opining herein on whether grounds exist for pseudonymity, but rather only that  
a proper motion must be filed supported by legal authority and meaningfully developed argument.

1 filed separately from any stipulation for the entry of a blanket protective order by which the parties may  
2 seek to designate discovery materials as confidential.<sup>2</sup>

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 DATED: February 14, 2018

5  
6   
NANCY J. KOPPE  
United States Magistrate Judge  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

---

23 <sup>2</sup> The stipulated protective order provides in some detail the grounds on which the parties believe  
24 certain information merits confidential treatment. *See* Docket No. 12 at 2-4. In reviewing a stipulated  
25 protective order, the Court will not be making any determination that any particular information warrants  
26 secrecy. Doing so would be impossible, as the Court does not have the actual documents to review. Instead,  
27 the Court will simply be providing a mechanism by which the parties may (in good faith) designate  
28 information as confidential. The Court does not put its imprimatur on such designation. Accordingly, to  
avoid confusion, any renewed stipulated protective order should omit discussion of the grounds on which  
the parties believe they may designate information as confidential and should focus instead solely on the  
mechanism by which they may do so.